EISENHOWER HIGH QUALITY PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM ASSESSMENT RUBRIC December 2001 Edition

	*HQPD Model District Score 10	Implementing HQPD Plan Score 8	Knowledge Building for HQPD Plan Score 6	Need for Improvement Score 4	Awareness Needed Score 2	Non-Compliance Score 1	Tot al
Standards/Methods	100 % of training reflects specific content aligned to Montana standards.	75% of training reflects specific content aligned to Montana standards.	50% of training reflects specific content aligned to Montana standards.	Most training received reflects information of broad content topics.	Training received reflects no state content standards.	Inappropriate spending as outlined in ESEA Title II regulations.	vide By
	100% of training reflects researched practices in teaching.	75% of training reflects researched practices in teaching.	50% of training reflects researched practices in teaching.	Most training reflects non-specific, general teaching strategies rather than specific methods and/or instructional strategies.	reflects no researched teaching strategies.	· ·	Add Scores and Divide By 2.
Data Analysis	At least three (3) data sources which include the following: Two (2) different forms of disaggregated <i>student performance</i> data and one quantified assessment of teacher needs or district (school) program needs.	At least two (2) data sources which include the following: One (1) form of disaggregated <i>student performance</i> data and one quantified assessment of teacher needs or district (school) program needs.	At least two (2) data sources which include the following: One (1) form of <i>student performance</i> data and one (1) quantified assessment of teacher needs or district (school) program needs.	At least one (1) data sourcewhich includes a quantified assess- ment of teacher needs or district (school) program needs.	Spending determined by comments or other anecdotal assessment from community, teacher, or school board, etc.	No evidence of any needs assessment or data to plan a HQPD program.	One Component Only
Equitability and At- k Students	At-risk students identified through multiple data sources and 100% of objectives name improvement for at risk students as a priority.	At-risk students identified through multiple data sources and 75% of objectives names improvement for at risk students as a priority.	At-risk students identified through at least one data source and at least one objective or indicator reflects improvement for at risk students in some way.	The district mentions at-risk students and cites at least one example of an approach to helping these students increase achievement.	No attempt to identify at-risk students has been made, however report mentions plan to disaggregate in the future.	No evidence of concern for at-risk students or future identification of at-risk group is made.	vide By 2.
Ed Risk S	All Title II funds support teachers teaching at-risk students or specific strategies named as best practices for at-risk student group.	75% of Title II funds support teachers teaching at-risk students or specific strategies named as best practices for at-risk student group.	50% of Title II funds support teachers teaching at-risk students or specific strategies named as best practices for at-risk student group.	25% of Title II funds support teachers teaching at-risk students or specific strategies named as best practices for at- risk student group.	No HQPD opportunities specifically address the needs of identified at-risk populations.	No evidence of concern for at-risk students or future identification of at-risk group is made	Add Scores and Divide By

	*HQPD Model District Score 10	Implementing HQPD Plan Score 8	Knowledge Building for HQPD Plan Score 6	Need for Improvement Score 4	Awareness Needed Score 2	Non-Compliance Score 1	Tot al
Alignment With Data Decision	Each objective for HQPD activities is directly aligned to the needs indicated in the data findings.	At least 66% of objectives for HQPD activities are directly aligned to the needs indicated in the data findings	One half of objectives for HQPD activities are aligned to the needs indicated in the data findings.	Although planned HQPD is provided, there is no evidence that there is an alignment between the data.	There is HQPD occurring, but there is no plan to accompany such development.	No evidence of any needs assessment or data to plan a HQPD program.	Add Scores and Divide By 2.
Alignme D	Objectives are measurable, measured and assessed and aligned to concrete baseline data and indicators.	Objectives are measurable, measured and assessed and aligned to concrete baseline data.	Objectives are measurable and assessable and baseline data and indicators are in some alignment.	Objectives are measurable but not aligned to indicators or baseline data.	Objectives are not measurable and baseline shows no alignment.	No evidence of any data to plan a HQPD program	Add Scores a
bility	Teams of teachers representing all grade levels and appropriate subjects and administrative staff and other stakeholders (e.g. parents) are actively involved in goal setting, using data, and planning and selecting HQPD activities.	Teams of teachers representing all grade levels and appropriate subjects and administrative staff are actively involved in goal setting and planning and selecting HQPD activities.	Teams of teachers and principals are involved in goal setting and planning and selecting HQPD activities.	Most funds spent through teacher requests with some criterion for approving or disapproving	Decision making done by one individual or very limited group of individuals.	No decisions made based on anything other than request for money. No planning of funds indicated.	
Sustainability	Institutionalization of new instructional methods or content is achieved through availability of necessary instructional material, collaboration and communication with others and with "expert." District resources are allocated for ongoing program assessment.	Implementation of new instructional methods and/or content is supported during "trial" period through organized activity and the availability of necessary instructional materials.	Some ongoing job embedded support for implementation has occurred, but it is not clear how much or to what degree it is planned.	Follow up of some type (for example, shared information from a conference with staff) but otherwise no support during implementation	No follow up of any type is mentioned and no PD indicates implementation of new content or method.	No decisions made based on anything other than request for money. No planning of funds indicated	Add Scores and Divide By 2.

December 2001 Edition

^{*}HPPD means High Quality Professional Development
*At Risk Students-Students identified as at-risk of not performing at proficient levels on State Standards, especially when a group is identified through disaggregation of data.